

# The North Branch Democrat.

HARVEY SICKLER, Proprietor.

"TO SPEAK HIS THOUGHTS IS EVERY FREEMAN'S RIGHT."—Thomas Jefferson.

TERMS: \$1.50 PER ANNUM

NEW SERIES.

TUNKHANNOCK, PA., WEDNESDAY, OCT. 7, 1863.

VOL. 3, NO. 9.

## North Branch Democrat.

A weekly Democratic paper, devoted to Politics, News, the Arts and Sciences &c. Published every Wednesday, at Tunkhannock, Wyoming County, Pa. BY HARVEY SICKLER.

Terms—1 copy 1 year, (in advance) \$1.50. If not paid within six months, \$2.00 will be charged.

### ADVERTISING.

10 lines or less, make three	four	two	three	six	one
one square	weeks	weeks	mo	th	mo
1 Square	1.00	1.25	2.25	2.57	3.00
2 do.	2.00	2.50	3.25	3.50	4.50
3 do.	3.00	3.75	4.75	5.50	7.00
1 Column	4.00	4.50	6.50	8.00	10.00
1 do.	6.00	7.00	10.00	12.00	17.00
1 do.	8.00	9.50	14.00	18.00	25.00
1 do.	10.00	12.00	17.00	22.00	30.00

Business Cards of one square, with paper, \$5.

### JOB WORK

of all kinds neatly executed, and at prices to suit the times.

### Business Notices.

BACON STAND.—Nicholson, Pa.—C. L. JACKSON, Proprietor.

H. S. COOPER, PHYSICIAN & SURGEON. Newton Centre, Luzerne County Pa.

GEO. S. TUTTON, ATTORNEY AT LAW. Tunkhannock, Pa. Office in Stark's Brick Block, Tioga street.

W. M. PIATT, ATTORNEY AT LAW. Office in Stark's Brick Block, Tioga St., Tunkhannock, Pa.

R. & S. W. LITTLE, ATTORNEYS AT LAW. Office on Tioga street, Tunkhannock Pa.

HARVEY SICKLER, ATTORNEY AT LAW and GENERAL INSURANCE AGENT.—Office, Bridge street, opposite Wall's Hotel, Tunkhannock Pa.

DR. J. C. CORSELIUS, HAVING LOCATED AT THE FALLS, WILL promptly attend all calls in the line of his profession—may be found at Bosser's Hotel, when not professionally absent. Falls, Oct. 10, 1861.

DR. J. C. BECKER & CO., PHYSICIANS & SURGEONS.

Would respectfully announce to the citizens of Wyoming that they have located at Tunkhannock where they will promptly attend to all calls in the line of their profession. May be found at his Drug Store when not professionally absent.

J. M. CAREY, M. D.—(Graduate of the M. Institute, Cincinnati) would respectfully announce to the citizens of Wyoming and Luzerne Counties, that he continues his regular practice in the various departments of his profession. May be found at his office or residence, when not professionally absent.

Particular attention given to the treatment of Chronic Diseases.

WALL'S HOTEL, LATE AMERICAN HOUSE, TUNKHANNOCK, WYOMING CO., PA.

THIS establishment has recently been refitted and furnished in the latest style. Every attention will be given to the comfort and convenience of those who patronize the House.

T. B. WALL, Owner and Proprietor. Tunkhannock, September 11, 1861.

MAYNARD'S HOTEL, TUNKHANNOCK, WYOMING COUNTY, PENNA.

JOHN MAYNARD, Proprietor.

HAVING taken the Hotel, in the Borough of Tunkhannock, recently occupied by Riley Warner, the proprietor respectfully solicits a share of public patronage. The House has been thoroughly repaired, and the comforts and accommodations of a first class Hotel, will be found by all who may favor it with their custom. September 11, 1861.

NORTH BRANCH HOTEL, MESHOPPEN, WYOMING COUNTY, PA.

Wm. H. CORTRIGHT, Prop'r

HAVING resumed the proprietorship of the above Hotel, the undersigned will spare no effort to render the house an agreeable place of sojourn for all who may favor it with their custom.

Wm. H. CORTRIGHT. June, 3rd, 1863

M. GILMAN, DENTIST.

M. GILMAN, has permanently located in Tunkhannock Borough, and respectfully tenders his professional services to the citizens of this place and surrounding country.

ALL WORK WARRANTED, TO GIVE SATISFACTION.

Office over Tutton's Law Office, near the Post Office. Dec. 11, 1861.

TO NERVOUS SUFFERERS OF BOTH SEXES.

A REVEREND GENTLEMAN HAVING BEEN restored to health in a few days, after undergoing all the usual routine and irregular expensive modes of treatment without success, considers it his sacred duty to communicate to his afflicted fellow creatures the means of cure. Hence, on the receipt of an addressed envelope, he will send (free) a copy of the prescription used. Direct to Dr JOHN M. DEXALL, 168 Fulton Street, Brooklyn, New York. v22241y

J. V. SMITH, M. D., PHYSICIAN & SURGEON, Office on Bridge Street, next door to the Democrat Office, Tunkhannock, Pa.

LIME FOR FARMERS, AS A FERTILIZER. VERNON Meshoppen, Sept. 18 1861.

Fresh Ground Plaster in Quantities and at prices to suit purchasers, now for sale at Meshoppen by K. Mowbray Jr

## Poet's Corner.

### THE HOUSEHOLD PET.

BY MRS. HELEN RICH.

We've a mimic man, a baby, With a pair of rough eyes, And a mouth of budding laughter, And a look that's very wise. Though his hair is not in ringlets, Or his eyes a lovely brown, He has dimples and a stammer, The delight of half the town.

And he wears a peacock feather In his little cap of plush, And he hearkens for Kris Kringle With a quick impatient hush. And he rides a caao as bravely As all boys of equal age, And we think him, without question, Quite the wonder of the age.

You should see him dance the polka, You should hear him try to sing; Now he ambles like a pony, Now he ties the cat with string. Then he reads you in the paper Of inverted ships in rows, With his grandpa's glasses mounted On his little ermie nose.

He will ask you if the lightning Is afraid to hear the thunder; And the moon upon the water Is a great and lovely wonder. He will question you of angels And of things beyond the skies, Till you cannot see a planet For the sudden tears that rise.

And he presses loving kisses Where those tender teardrops lay, And he tries to cheer you sweetly In his simple earnest way. And he tells you of the marvels He will execute and plan, When he grows as big as papa, When he gets to be a man.

We have named him from a hero, We have mapped his future fair; He shall wear a poet's laurel 'Mid his dark and glossy hair. We forget that we are weary, We forget that we are old, For our darling is beauty, He's our little store of gold.

We have heard of tortured bosoms, We have heard of royal Lear, But we know our little blessing Will not cost our hearts a tear. For a manhood looketh bravely From the forehead of our boy, And we hail it as a token Of a rich and perfect joy.

Oh, he's but a tiny mortal, And he may not live to know How important the wonders That but wait for him to grow. And he may not know how gracious To our souls his baby art, As we love him all as fondly As from death he dwelt apart.

God forgive us if we listen To a parent's easy pride; God forgive us if we mightling That young angel by our side. May the Father look in pity On the love that prayeth wild, "Take all earthly blessings from us, But in mercy spare our child!"

### SOLDIERS, REMEMBER THAT IT WAS THE ABOLITIONISTS WHO CONTESTED YOUR RIGHT TO VOTE!

We again refer to the subject of the Soldiers vote of 1861, that the returned soldiers may know through whose instrumentality the soldiers vote of that year was thrown out by the Court.

In 1861, Judge Thompson, Abolitionist, received a majority of the votes of the citizens of Philadelphia, at home, for the office of Sheriff. Mr. Ewing, Democrat, his opponent, with the vote of the citizens at home and in the army, had a majority over Thompson, and received the certificate of election and entered upon the duties of his office. Thompson contested the right of Ewing to hold the position, in the Common Pleas of that city, on the ground of the unconstitutionality of the Soldiers Vote! The Court decided in favor of Thompson. The matter was carried up to the Supreme Court, and Judges Woodward, Strong and Read, Abolitionist affirmed the decision of the court below. Judge Woodward, then must have been governed wholly by legal consideration in his decision and not by party motives, for if the latter had had any controlling influence with him, he would not have sustained the inferior court, and Ewing, Democrat, would have retained the office of Sheriff—the emoluments of which are nearly equal, if not altogether, to the salary of the President of the United States. It was the cupidity of an Abolitionist that forced such a decision and hence cast aside the soldiers vote and thus disfranchised them. Will the Abolition journals, in their ravings, tell us whether legal and Constitutional motives governed Judge Woodward and a majority of the Bench, in the matter of Thompson vs. Ewing, political considerations and prejudices? Which?

"We would rather see Lee advance with his cohorts into the heart of Pennsylvania than witness the inauguration of Woodward as Governor of the State."—Harrisburg Telegraph (Abolition).

"A REBEL," is one who rebels against the Constitution.

### A LETTER TO EDWARD EVERETT.

I have read with astonishment and sorrow, the report of a speech recently delivered by you before a political society of Boston called the "Union Club." It is indeed a sad time for our country, when men of your intellect and standing turn their backs upon the principles and professions of a life time, and consent to become the special pleaders for an administration which is clearly seeking to overthrow not only the Union, but the very form of the government established by our fathers. Up to the hour of the beginning of this war, you occupied the position of a wise, conservative patriot, and were, therefore, an enemy to our Northern fanaticism, which you long foresaw was driving the ship of state upon the rocks. Often did you warn these madmen that the end of their sectional agitation would be the dissolution of the Union. You cannot unsay the many noble words of truth and patriotism you have uttered. There they stand, and there they will stand when you are dead, an everlasting rebuke to the real authors of our country's ruin, and a protest against the closing acts of your own life, when you went over into the ranks of intolerant and bloody fanaticism, and turned your face away from the wise and honorable records which your manhood had made.—You, who stood so long at the top and radiance of conservative truth, seem to have plunged to the very bottom of radical abolition falsehood. Allow me respectfully to call your attention to some of the "sophistries of your late speech.

You assume that there is no way of saving the Union but by fighting; and that all who are opposed to the war are in favor of letting the South go. Your whole argument is based upon this sophistry. You do not offer a single word of proof that it is possible to save the Union by fighting. You assume it. But, sir, hundreds and thousands of your countrymen assume just the reverse; that it is impossible to save the Union by fighting. This is the question to be discussed. You do an injustice to your fellow-citizens by assuming that they "are in favor of letting the South go," because they are opposed to this barbarous war. They do not propose to let the South go, as long as there is left one reasonable hope—a possible chance of retaining it.—But they believe, with the lamented Senator Douglas, that "war is dissolution—final and eternal separation." You believed the same two years ago. In a letter which you wrote to a meeting in Faneuil Hall, dated at Washington Feb. 2d, 1861, you said:

"To expect to hold fifteen States in the Union by force is preposterous. The idea of a civil war, accompanied as it would be by a servile insurrection, is too monstrous to be entertained for a moment. If our sister States must leave us, in the name of heaven, let them go in peace."

That is the truth; and it shows that those with whom you now fraternize, and whose apologist you have become, are alone responsible for this barbarous war. The following passage in the speech of Senator Hugh, of Ohio, delivered on the occasion, will be read with interest:

"The Crittenden proposition has been endorsed by the almost unanimous vote of the Legislature of the noble old Commonwealth of Virginia. It has been petitioned for by a larger number of electors of the United States than any proposition that was ever before Congress. I believe in my heart, to-day that it would carry an overwhelming majority of the people of my State; and, sir, and of nearly every State in the Union. Before the Senators from the State of Mississippi left this Chamber, I heard one of them, who now assumes at least to be President of the Southern Confederacy, propose to accept it and maintain the Union, if that proposition could receive the vote it ought to receive from the other side of this Chamber. Therefore, of all your propositions, of all your amendments, knowing as I do, and knowing that the historian will write it down, at any time before the 1st of January a two-thirds vote for the Crittenden resolutions in this Chamber would have saved every State in the Union but South Carolina. Georgia would be here by her representatives, and Louisiana also—those two great States, which at least would have broken the whole column of secession."—Globe, page, 1,380.

This, sir, settles the question as to who is to blame for this war. It shows that you have allowed yourself to become the endorsers and the vendor of the misrepresentations and falsehoods upon which the administration relies to cheat the people into a support of its iniquitous designs. The countenance which men like you have given to the usurpers and conspirators, has been the chief source of Lincoln's power to do evil. Left to themselves, these radical traitors could never have achieved the ruin they have brought upon our country. In your past career, you have often enough warned them, that if they kept on in their mad course they would destroy their country. You have wound up by joining their bloody band, and the name of Edward Everett must sink in history by the side of such names as Garrison, Sumner, Phillips, Seward, Lincoln, and old John Brown. A true history of the fall of this Union will one day be written, in which all the sophistries and lies that cover the present hour will be swept away, and the men of this day will stand forth in the light of truth and justice. Then, sir, the men whom you denounce as traitors and enemies of their country, will occupy the proud rank of patriots and wise conservators of the nation's honor, while the murderous clan of fanatics and impostors with which you have mixed your declining days, will sit in the seats of the condemned and despised. When it is at last seen that war could not save the Union; that this was never designed to save it; that, on the other hand, the war was carried on for the purpose of destroying not only the Union, but the Republic itself, then the day of justice and of judgment will come to all of us. Then, thank God, my name will not be found in company with the disciples of old John Brown, who have hounded on the war-devils that have destroyed our land.—

These, sir, are words which you can never unsay. No folly, no apostasy of yours can ever obliterate them. There they will stand a glorious monument of what you once were, and a perpetual rebuke and shame for what

you now are. A few short months ago, you denounced the idea of maintaining the Union by "military prowess" as "self-contradictory," and as being "loaded with the death-smell from fields wet with brother's blood." Now you even endorse the arming of negroes for the purpose of plundering and murdering the white men, women, and children of the South. How are the mighty fallen! You talk idly and vainly of the "restraints of military discipline" among armed negroes, set on by the incendiary fanaticism of abolition Generals. By these Generals, white men have been led in battle, not like the armies of a Christian and civilized nation, but like marauding and plundering bands of assassins, violating every law of civilized warfare. How can you hope for better things of armed negroes led by the same abolition marauders?

Sir, the bad company into which you have fallen seems to have rendered you careless in the statements of facts—a thing which certainly could never with justice have been said of you in other days. In a recent oration at the Tremont Temple, Boston, you asserted that the failure of the Crittenden Compromise was caused, purposely, by the action of the Senators from the Cotton States. Just the reverse of this is true, for it was the Republican Senators who purposely caused the failure of that just measure, and thereby caused the war. The following passage from the speech of Senator Douglas, made in the Senate Jan. 3, 1861, proves the entire incorrectness of your statement:

"I believe this (his plan) to be a fair basis of amicable adjustment. If you of the Republican side are not willing to accept this, nor the proposition of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Crittenden), pray tell us what you are willing to do? I address the inquiry to the Republicans alone, for the reason that, in the Committee of Thirteen, a few days ago, every member from the South, including those from the Cotton States (Messrs. Davis and Toombs), expressed their readiness to accept the proposition of my venerable friend from Kentucky, Mr. Crittenden, as a final settlement of the controversy, if tendered and sustained by the Republican members. Hence the sole responsibility of our disagreement, and the only difficulty in the way of an amicable adjustment, is with the Republican party."

That is the truth; and it shows that those with whom you now fraternize, and whose apologist you have become, are alone responsible for this barbarous war.

The following passage in the speech of Senator Hugh, of Ohio, delivered on the occasion, will be read with interest:

"The Crittenden proposition has been endorsed by the almost unanimous vote of the Legislature of the noble old Commonwealth of Virginia. It has been petitioned for by a larger number of electors of the United States than any proposition that was ever before Congress. I believe in my heart, to-day that it would carry an overwhelming majority of the people of my State; and, sir, and of nearly every State in the Union. Before the Senators from the State of Mississippi left this Chamber, I heard one of them, who now assumes at least to be President of the Southern Confederacy, propose to accept it and maintain the Union, if that proposition could receive the vote it ought to receive from the other side of this Chamber. Therefore, of all your propositions, of all your amendments, knowing as I do, and knowing that the historian will write it down, at any time before the 1st of January a two-thirds vote for the Crittenden resolutions in this Chamber would have saved every State in the Union but South Carolina. Georgia would be here by her representatives, and Louisiana also—those two great States, which at least would have broken the whole column of secession."—Globe, page, 1,380.

This, sir, settles the question as to who is to blame for this war. It shows that you have allowed yourself to become the endorsers and the vendor of the misrepresentations and falsehoods upon which the administration relies to cheat the people into a support of its iniquitous designs. The countenance which men like you have given to the usurpers and conspirators, has been the chief source of Lincoln's power to do evil. Left to themselves, these radical traitors could never have achieved the ruin they have brought upon our country. In your past career, you have often enough warned them, that if they kept on in their mad course they would destroy their country. You have wound up by joining their bloody band, and the name of Edward Everett must sink in history by the side of such names as Garrison, Sumner, Phillips, Seward, Lincoln, and old John Brown. A true history of the fall of this Union will one day be written, in which all the sophistries and lies that cover the present hour will be swept away, and the men of this day will stand forth in the light of truth and justice. Then, sir, the men whom you denounce as traitors and enemies of their country, will occupy the proud rank of patriots and wise conservators of the nation's honor, while the murderous clan of fanatics and impostors with which you have mixed your declining days, will sit in the seats of the condemned and despised. When it is at last seen that war could not save the Union; that this was never designed to save it; that, on the other hand, the war was carried on for the purpose of destroying not only the Union, but the Republic itself, then the day of justice and of judgment will come to all of us. Then, thank God, my name will not be found in company with the disciples of old John Brown, who have hounded on the war-devils that have destroyed our land.—

Let it not be thought presumption in me, that I ask you to pause and reflect where your name will be then. Ah! sir, this hour is mad. Untruth and injustice, nay, downright falsehood, cover men's minds as with a pall. God's Justice seems to sleep. Our country may not be saved; liberty may not survive; but truth at last will prevail. God and truth are mightier than sin and falsehood. The "loyal" pretenders of this day will be the "traitors" of history. Seward & Co. and Benedict Arnold & Co. Sir, the men whom you stigmatize as traitors will not be there.

Your obedient servant,  
C. CHAUNCEY BURR.

Is the System of Slave Labor in the Southern States a Sin?

A false theology, as well as false politics, has afflicted the Northern, and especially the New England States, for years past. A party has risen up which affects to be "wise above what is written" in the sacred Scriptures as well as in the Constitution. They pronounce negro slavery not only the "sum of all villainies," but a sin in a theological sense. Many well meaning citizens have been misled by these false doctrines.

As theology and politics have been presented to the public, it is refreshing to see the views of the friends of the Constitution sustained from a theological standpoint.

Our attention has been called to an able article published in one of the religious newspapers of this city under the date of Nov. 6, 1862. The editor of the paper relied upon a certain text of scripture to sustain the Emancipation Proclamation of Mr. LINCOLN. The text reads, "Art thou called being a servant? care not for it; if thou mayest be made free, use it rather."

He submitted this passage to a friend, with the desire that he would give his views in regard to it. This request elicited the following reply:

PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 10, 1862.

Rev. and Dear Sir: In response to your request, I herewith present briefly my views of the 21st verse of the 7th chapter of 1st Corinthians.

I beg to premise that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament recognize, without objection, the relation of master and slave.—The acceptance of the Gospel of Christ by faith and practice makes individuals better husbands and wives, parents and children, and masters and slaves. There are rules presented for slaves as well as for masters. Servants—the Greek word is *doublei*, that is to say slaves—are required to be obedient to their masters, and count them worthy of all honor. And St. Paul says, that if any man teach otherwise, "he is proud, knowing nothing, but doing about questions and strifes of words whereof cometh envy, strife, railing evil surmising, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth." From such we are commanded to withdraw ourselves. The text to which you refer enjoins upon every one to be contented with his condition in life. "Art thou called being a servant (slave)? care not for it; but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather." In other words, Grace knows no distinction of freedom or servitude; therefore bear it patiently. The learned Grotius, who is good legal as well as Biblical authority says: "And, above all, let it not drive the slave to seek his freedom by unjustifiable means." He is not to quit the service of his master except with his consent. Christianity does not favor the violation of any civil obligation, either by the party in interest, or by any one else for him. Referring to the last words of the text in question, I understand that you incline to the opinion that the Emancipation Proclamation of President Lincoln gives the slave the right of freedom. But where do you find the authority for the President to exercise such power? The Constitution of the United States recognizes the relation of master and slave. The right to dissolve this relation is not one of the powers delegated to the Congress of the United States, nor to the General Government, much less to the Executive authority of the Government; it is among the rights reserved to the States and to the people. I know that this arbitrary power is claimed to be a part of the military law.—But this law only extends to the government of the army and navy of the United States, and to the militia of the States when called into the service of the United States. Neither is it within the scope of martial law. This law at the most only gives authority over persons and property under the actual control and dominion of the military commander.

As to the right of the President to issue the proclamation in question, I beg to refer to the opinion of the Hon. B. F. Curtis, late a Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States. He ought to be considered good authority on subjects of this character, especially as he delivered the dissenting opinion in the Dred Scott case.

Judge Curtis says: "Whence, then, do those edicts of the President spring? They spring from the assumed power to extend martial-law over the whole United States; a power for the exercise of which there is no warrant whatever in the Constitution; a power which no people could confer upon an Executive officer and remain a free people, for it would make him absolute master of their lives, their liberties and their property."

" \* \* \* Let us beware how we borrow weapons from the armory of arbitrary power. They cannot be wielded by the hands of a free people. Their blows will finally fall upon themselves. Distracted councils, divided strength, are the very earliest effects of an attempt to use them. What lies beyond no patriot is willing to look upon."

I close this communication by presenting the following points, which are, in my opinion, established by the authorities referred to herein:

1. First. The relation of master and slave is recognized as a lawful relation in the Sacred Scriptures, and herein:
2. In the covenant with Abraham.
3. In the laws of Moses.

3. In the Gospel and the Epistles of the New Testament.

4. These various authorities prescribe rules for the master and for the slave.

Second. The relation is sanctioned by the highest and most obligatory civil authorities of our country, and herein:

1. By the Constitution and laws of the United States.
2. By the Constitutions and laws of the several States in which negro slavery exists.
3. By the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and these decisions are declared by the Constitution to be the Supreme law of the land.

Third. I. A relation thus sanctioned cannot, with propriety, be stated to be an unlawful relation.

2. It cannot be dissolved, except by the authority which established it—namely the State Governments, or the voluntary act of the master.

Fourth. There is no authority given to Congress or the Government at Washington to abolish this relation; that power being among those which are retained by the people, or by the States affected thereby.

It hence follows, as a logical conclusion, that no proclamation or edict by the President of the United States, or by Congress, or by both, or by other States, can legally affect the relation of master or slave in the States where it is established. These outside authorities cannot say to the slave—"Thou mayest be made free."

I beg to add that this argument does not assert the relation of master and slave to be of Divine appointment, like that of husband and wife, and parent and child, but only that it is a lawful one, such as master and apprentice, guardian and ward, trustee and cestui que trust, and others which might be stated. The parties who hold these relations to each other have certain rights and duties, which can only be set aside or controlled by the exercise of a lawful authority having jurisdiction of the subject.

I am, with sincere regard, your friend and obedient servant. J. R. S.

This admirable letter, it is understood, was written by our well known townsman, Hon. JAMES ROSS SNOWDEN. Its republication at this time is very opportune, and will enable our friends to give a good answer to those fanatics and pharisees who have, a holy horror of the relation of negro slavery, whilst they neglect the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy and faith.—Philadelphia Age.

### THE TONNAGE TAX SWINDLE.

Tax-payers of Wyoming county! you have an account to settle with Gov. Curtin. The Legislature of this State, in 1861, released by law, the Pennsylvania Rail Road Company from the payment of Tonnage Tax, which deprived the State of a just Revenue to the amount of some three hundred thousand dollars a year! Nay more, at that time the Rail Road owed the State seven hundred thousand dollars for the two previous years tax. The Legislature, in a section of the same bill repealing the Tonnage Tax, wiped out this debt! So by this one act of the Legislature—which was then composed of a two-thirds Republican majority in both Houses—the State sustained a loss of the Tonnage Tax then amounting to \$300,000 a year (it would be a million a year by this time,) and also the \$700,000 that was due her!

Gov. Curtin engineered this plundering Bill through the Legislature and placed his signature to it. Remember these facts, people of Wyoming, when you go to vote on the 13th inst.

WHICH IS RIGHT.—Hon. George W. Woodward is a Supreme Judge—paid by the people for his services. He does not take the Stump—though a much abler speaker than Curtin. He gives his time for which he is paid to the State, in the performance of his duties. Andrew G. Curtin is also paid by the State to perform the duties of Governor. He takes the money but spends the time for which he is paid, in making STUMP SPEECHES FOR HIMSELF—thus defrauding the tax payers and receiving money for service which he does not perform. Which of the two is acting in the best faith to the tax payers of this State.

DISUNIONIST.—On the 1st of February, 1860, Senator Hale, of New Hampshire, now a "loyalist," presented to the Senate of the United States, two petitions from citizens of Pennsylvania, praying that "some plan might be devised for the dissolution of the American Union."

Every Republican Senator voted for the petitions. Mark the names of the traitors: John P. Hale, of Massachusetts. William H. Seward, of New York. Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio.

In the House, on the 25th of the same month, the petitions were presented by Joshua R. Giddings, now an officer under Lincoln's Union Administration. Every Republican Representative voted for the petitions, to wit:

- Chas. Allen, of Massachusetts.
- Chas. Durkee, of Wisconsin.
- Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio.
- Rufus K. Goodnow, of Maine.

A BAD CASE OF "NIGGER ON THE BRAIN."—Col. Wm. M. Stone, the Administration candidate for Governor of Iowa, in a recent speech made at Keokuk, said:

"I admit that this is an Abolition war.—It was not such in the start; but the Administration has discovered that it could not subdue the South else than by making it an Abolition war, and they have done so; and it will be continued as an Abolition war so long as there is one slave at the South to be made free. \* \* \* I would rather eat with a nigger, drink with a nigger, live with a nigger, and sleep with a nigger, than with a Copperhead."